PATTERNS OF POWER

FRAMEWORK ADDENDUM

A Conquest That Cannot Be Named

How to run the twelve modules on a Soviet acquisition

Where the standard questions break and what to ask instead; the vocabulary you will not find without the words; the cases worth taking; and the traps peculiar to this archive

Thomas J. Bryan
with Claude (Anthropic)

Held as tested, not revealed.

CONTENTS

What this addendum is for

The modules, adjusted

The vocabulary you will not find without the words

The cases worth taking, and what each is good for

Traps peculiar to this archive

What this addendum is for

The twelve modules were built from cases in which a state took a territory, said so, and made arrangements. A Soviet acquisition is a case in which a state took a territory and was **doctrinally forbidden to have done so** — because the doctrine held that colonialism was a feature of capitalism, that the revolution had abolished it, and that what was happening in the acquired territory was liberation from the previous empire.

That single disability reshapes every module, and a study that runs the standard questions without adjusting them will produce answers that look like evasions. Ask "what was the settlement" of a territory where private ownership was abolished rather than redistributed and you will get nothing. Ask "was formation withheld" of an order that built native-language universities and you will conclude, wrongly, that this was not a conquest at all.

This addendum sets out the adjustments. It assumes the reader has the Field Manual and has read **The Sincere Machine**, which establishes the doctrinal argument this one takes as given: that the founders' sincerity was real and made no difference; that a doctrine sealed against refutation turns believers into guardians; that a permanent emergency is structurally required never to end; and that a hierarchy which cannot name itself must substitute terror for the naturalisation every other order enjoys. This addendum does not re-argue any of that. It converts it into working instructions.

One framing note before the modules. Do not open a study by asking whether the Soviet Union was an empire. That question is contested, it is politically live in every country concerned, and it cannot be settled in a preface. Run the instruments instead,

report what they return, and let the reader do the naming. If the machinery is the same machinery, the reader will see it without being told; if it is not, a study that had asserted the conclusion up front would have concealed the more interesting finding.

The modules, adjusted

Landscape

The standard instruction stands: establish that what the conqueror found was itself a former conquest that had reached the self-running pole. Soviet cases make this easy and tempting, because the previous order was usually a Tsarist conquest still within living memory, and the temptation is to accept the incoming regime's own periodisation — everything before 1917 as one undifferentiated darkness.

Resist it. The relevant landscape is usually **triple**: an older indigenous order, a Tsarist or other imperial layer over it, and then a brief interval — 1917 to 1920 or 1918 to 1940 — in which something local governed. That interval is where the counterfactual lives, and Module 12 will need it. The Baltic republics, the Ukrainian and Transcaucasian states of 1918–21, the Kokand autonomy, the Alash Orda: each of these is a documented instance of what the territory's own people did when they had the chance, and a study that skips them has thrown away the only evidence that bears on whether the outcome required this conqueror.

Establish also what the metropole was at the moment of acquisition, and be specific about which moment. A territory taken in 1920 by a state fighting for its existence, a territory taken in 1939 by secret protocol, and a territory taken in 1945 by an army that had just won a war of annihilation are three different conquerors wearing one name.

Module 1 — The Floor of Force

Count twice. Every Soviet acquisition has two floors and the second is usually the larger.

The first is the ordinary one: the army arrives, resistance is broken, casualties are counted. That figure will often be modest — in several cases the incorporation was effected with very little fighting.

The second is applied to the population afterwards, **by category rather than by conduct**, and it is not counter-insurgency. It is the removal of people who fall inside a classification the doctrine requires to exist: proprietors, clergy, officers, officials of the previous state, and their households. It arrives as deportation, as quota, as the special-settler transports. It is frequently ordered in advance of any resistance, in numbers fixed centrally before anyone in the territory has been assessed.

That distinction has to be held all the way through, because collapsing it produces the standard apologia — that the violence was a response to armed opposition. Sometimes it was. But a deportation list drawn up before the annexation, with numbers allocated per district, is not a response to anything; it is the doctrine being applied to a terrain, and it will usually be documented as such.

So: two counts, two dates, two mechanisms, and an explicit finding on which was larger.

Module 2 — The Settlement

The standard question is who got what. In a Soviet acquisition the answer is that nobody got anything, because private ownership in the productive sense was abolished rather than transferred. There are no grants, no fiefs, no titles, and no register of new proprietors to examine.

This does not mean there was no settlement. It means the settlement was made in a different currency, and there are two things to look for.

The fiction is restoration. Not vacancy, not recognition, not divisibility. The claim is that the land is being returned to those from whom it was taken, which places the incoming order in the position of a restorer of a prior right rather than a taker of a present one. Find the instrument that says so and quote it exactly; the grammar will repay attention, because a restoration is even harder to characterise as a taking than a recognition is.

And the settlement is a settlement of categories. This is the adjustment that matters. Where another conqueror divides land, this one divides *persons* — into classes with different legal capacities, different rations, different rights of residence and different liability to removal. The question "who got what" becomes **"which categories were declared to exist, by what instrument, on what criteria, filled by what procedure, and with what consequences attaching."**

Look in particular for categories the terrain did not contain and which had therefore to be produced. Where a doctrine requires a rural exploiting class and the territory has none in the required form, one will be defined and filled, often by quota allocated downward to districts that then had to find people to put in it. **A class fiction of that kind is a settlement instrument and belongs in this module**, and it is a genuine addition to the framework's list, because the other three fictions all concern land and this one concerns people.

Module 3 — The Robe

Here the standard prediction inverts, and the inversion is the most useful thing in the whole addendum.

The framework expects a colonial robe to be cut for the metropole whose belief funds the conquest, with little or nothing addressed to the conquered. Soviet robes are addressed to the

conquered directly and explicitly: *you are being liberated from the empire that held you, and your nationhood is being restored to you.*

That is not cynicism and should not be written as though it were. It follows from the doctrine, and the doctrine required it — a movement that condemned imperialism could not administer a territory in imperialism's vocabulary even privately, and the internal documents will generally show the same language as the public ones, which is itself a finding worth recording.

The diagnostic accordingly changes. Since force never pays for what it does not need, ask **what the order spent on the conquered's own language, institutions and symbols when it was under no compulsion to spend anything.** Native-language publishing houses, native-language instruction, a republic with a name, a flag, an academy of sciences, a codified literary standard, a written constitutional right of secession. Those are real expenditures and they are the robe's price, and they distinguish this order sharply from every European colonial administration in the collection, none of which paid anything comparable.

Then ask the harder question, which the module exists for. **What did the robe make unsayable?** A regime that has abolished colonialism cannot describe its own periphery as a colony; a regime that has abolished exploitation cannot describe an unequal exchange as one; a regime whose doctrine predicts the withering of religion cannot report that religion has not withered. Each of those is a description that has been foreclosed, and the foreclosures are what Module 7 will find in the censorship files.

Module 4 — Formation

Formation is not withheld; it is maximised. So the module's standard question — was formation withheld, and did the

old order therefore hold the field — has to be replaced by a sharper one.

Separate substitution from assault, because they produce opposite results and both will be present.

Substitution is the offer of a new formation in place of an old one: schools, literacy campaigns, a new script, professional training, a career open to a peasant's child. Where the doctrine's underlying prediction happened to be correct — that people want to read, that parents want their children to survive, that a population excluded from learning will take it if offered — substitution worked, and worked at a scale no European colonial power approached. Record that plainly; it is a real achievement and the study is falsified if it omits it.

Assault is the attack on an existing formation without replacing it: the closure of religious institutions, the burning of garments, the prohibition of a rite. Where this was attempted the practice did not disappear. It went into the household, where it needed no institution, and it hardened from custom into a marker of identity — after which it was defended by a population with no state and no organisation, at the cost of its own members' lives.

And there is a third movement peculiar to these cases: **the formation built is later decapitated.** The native cadre that indigenisation created becomes, within a decade, the suspect class, and is destroyed. A study must date all three movements separately and not average them into a single policy.

Finally, and this connects to Module 11: watch the campaigns aimed at women. They are frequently the sharpest instrument in the formation programme and the most costly to the people they were supposed to liberate, and their casualties do not appear in any institutional record because no office was abolished and no income extinguished.

Module 5 — The Cost Column

Two adjustments, both structural.

The residual is a classification, not a possession. In most orders a subject's last defence is something he holds — a plot, a trade, a household, a legal disability he reads as a protection. Here what he holds is his *record*: what he is written down as being. And a classification can be revoked administratively, retroactively, and by descent — a man's grandfather's holdings can reclassify him. That makes the residual uniquely fragile, and it means the module must price *the category* rather than the property.

And the exit is abolished rather than made expensive. Elsewhere the corpus reads a ledger through emigration figures, because what people paid to be elsewhere is the price they put on staying. Here the frontier is closed, internal movement is licensed, and residence requires permission. So the exit evidence has to be found in the forms that remain: flight across a border where one was still crossable, and the timing of it; the choice of a legal category over an illegal one; the decision to conceal an origin. Where a population did have a window of exit and used it, the figures are unusually informative precisely because the window was narrow.

Module 6 — Extraction

Do not look for a tax schedule. The instrument is **the plan and the procurement price**.

The mechanism to establish is a state monopsony: the sole permitted purchaser sets a compulsory delivery quota and the price at which it will pay, and where that price sits below the cost of production the difference is the extraction. Find the quota, find the price, find who set them and to whom the product went. That is the module's spine and it will be documented, because a planned economy generates paper.

Two complications the module must hold rather than resolve.

The first is that the flow frequently runs **both ways**. Capital investment, industrial plant, irrigation works, schools and hospitals were built in acquired territories at real expense while the terms of trade extracted through procurement prices. Whether any given territory was a net contributor or a net recipient is genuinely disputed, the calculations are sensitive to the shadow prices chosen, and both the successor states and the Russian Federation have present positions on the answer. Report the dispute, set out what each side counts, and do not adjudicate.

The second is the monoculture problem, which recurs. Where a territory was specialised into a single crop for the metropole's industry, its carrying capacity ceases to be a function of its acreage and becomes a function of a planning decision taken elsewhere — which is the same finding the collection reached about a colony reduced to sugar, arriving by a different route.

Module 7 — Information and Suppression

This is where Soviet cases break the corpus's standing finding, and the study should say so at the top of the module rather than discovering it at the bottom.

The collection's general result is that the censor existed and was not needed — that metropolitan publics were indifferent and nothing had to be hidden from them. That does not hold here. The censorship apparatus was enormous, permanent, and faced in both directions at once, and the reason is the one Module 3 identified: the thing at risk was not the reputation of a distant government but **the metropole's own account of itself**, which the doctrine made load-bearing.

Two instruments to distinguish, because the second is the important one and it is not the same as the first.

Censorship concedes that a fact is a fact and forbids its circulation. Ordinary, universal, and present here in industrial quantity.

Annulment rules that the fact was not a fact. A count that returns the wrong answer is declared to have been improperly conducted; the people who produced it are prosecuted not for a political offence but for professional incompetence; and the question is removed from the next instrument so that the observation can no longer be made. That is a different operation and the framework did not previously have it. Where a study finds it, it should be named as such and traced: what was measured, what came back, what the charge was, what happened to the measurers, and what changed in the instrument afterwards.

The general mechanism behind it belongs in this module too. Where a governing claim cannot be revised, a result that contradicts it cannot be an error in the claim, so it must be an error in a person — which converts an epistemic problem into a personnel problem and generates an unbounded demand for investigators.

Module 8 — Elite Coordination and the Default

The elite here is **appointed, not landed**. It holds no property, its position is not heritable, and it can be removed by a decision taken elsewhere, with consequences that extend to its family. That makes it more dependent than any co-opted aristocracy in the collection, and — this is the counter-intuitive part — it makes the default *stronger* rather than weaker, because no one has an independent base from which to sustain a dissent.

The module's questions accordingly become: how were natives recruited into the apparatus, on what terms, with what ceiling; who among them held real decision rights and who held a title; and what happened to the ones who developed a position of their own.

And there is a test available at the end that no other case in the collection offers so cleanly. **Look at 1991 and after.** If the

same men held power under a new flag, with a new legitimating claim, in the same buildings, the default was a structure of positions rather than a set of beliefs — and the ideology's evaporation without a corresponding change in who held what is the strongest evidence the framework will ever get for that proposition.

Module 9 — Plurality or Foreclosure

The union republics had constitutions, legislatures, supreme courts, national academies, and — in the Soviet case uniquely — **a written constitutional right of secession**.

The module's job is not to dismiss these as facades. It is to run the framework's actual test, which is not about the existence of a right but about the existence of **a body obliged to hear someone who invokes it**. The collection's finding is that a legitimating formula becomes something functionally like a right at the point where an institution must receive people repeating it back, and not before: petitions in the emperor's own language of impartial benevolence got a franchise extended because the House of Peers had to receive them; thirty-one petitions to a court obliged to hear nothing produced nothing at all.

So establish, concretely: was there any forum, at any point, before which a claim under the constitutional text could be brought and would have to be answered? Where the answer is no, the written right is the purest available case of a formula with no forum, and it tests the residue mechanism by its absence — which is a genuine contribution, because every other case in the corpus tests it by its presence.

Report the rings of inclusion and their dates as usual, and note that here the rings are drawn by category rather than by property or residence.

Module 10 — Change and Collapse

The framework's prediction — that structural change comes from the armed and from the centre rather than from the ground — fires very cleanly in these cases and the module should let it, without overclaiming.

Establish what actually cracked the floor. In most Soviet acquisitions the answer is that the metropole's will emptied in the capital, for reasons largely unconnected to the territory, and the territory became independent without having asked at the moment of asking. Where there had been movements demanding it, establish honestly what they had achieved before the centre gave way and what they achieved because it did.

Then ask the naturalisation question. A conquest naturalises when nothing about the territory any longer requires a separate decision. Where one question must still be answered separately — a language law, a garrison, a border, a diaspora, a pipeline — the status has not dissolved; it has migrated into that question and gone on living there.

Module 11 — The Grim Accounting

Expect this to be the largest module in the study and plan the research accordingly.

The metabolic column behaves differently here than anywhere else in the corpus. Elsewhere a preserved order defaults late and by price — a commodity collapses, and a population that had been specialised into it starves years or decades after the conquest. Here the coordination is **abolished by decree**, at speed, and the note comes due within about three years. Where a study finds a pastoral or agrarian system that had held a population on land that could not otherwise carry it, and finds that system dismantled deliberately, it should expect a mortality event and should look for it.

Three disciplines are non-negotiable in this module.

Ranges, always, with sources named. Every mortality figure in this field is contested and the contest is political in every

country concerned. A study that states a single number has taken a side without arguing for it.

Count what was built, in the same module and at the same length. Literacy from near-nothing to near-universal; clinics and falling infant mortality; universities and academies where none existed; women in professions from which the previous order had excluded them absolutely. These are real, they are large, and no European colonial power did anything comparable. A ledger that omits them is not a ledger.

And do not let the horror do the work. The atrocity is not the finding. The mechanism is. A module that establishes how many died and stops has produced a number that everybody already knew and no explanation of anything.

Module 12 — Convergence and Divergence

The counter-position here is stronger than in any other case in the collection and must be stated at full strength, from the people who actually make it: that this was not colonialism but development; that the comparison with European empires is a category error; that the territories were net recipients of investment; that the nations now sovereign were constituted under this order and their borders drawn by it; and that the alternative on offer in 1920 was not independence but a different empire.

The answer this collection has found does not deny any of that. It rests on two distinctions.

The relevant alternative is not the absence of modernisation. It is the same modernisation carried out by the people it was done to. Where the record shows a local movement already pursuing schools, presses, script reform and women's education before the conquest, the counterfactual is not stagnation, and the difference the conquest made is not whether these things happened but **who was holding the pen and to whom he could be made to answer.**

And the achievements and the atrocities came out of one doctrine held two different ways. Where its predictions had been arrived at from an observed record — that people will take literacy if it is free, that clinics reduce infant mortality — the programme delivered spectacularly. Where they were deduced from first principles — what belief is, what holds it, what a society necessarily contains — the programme failed, and the failure could not be read as a refutation, so it was repeated. That single distinction disposes of the two easy explanations at once. It was not cruelty, because the same administration built the clinics. It was not incompetence, because the same administration ran a first-class statistical service.

The vocabulary you will not find without the words

Much of this record is searchable only if you know the term. These are the ones a study will need and will not guess.

Nationalities and formation. *Korenizatsiya* (indigenisation) · *natsional'noe razmezhevanie* (national-territorial delimitation) · *likbez* (the literacy campaign) · *hujum* (the assault, of the unveiling campaign) · *vydvizhentsy* (workers promoted into administration) · *latinizatsiya* and the subsequent Cyrillisation of scripts.

Categories and the settlement of persons. *Raskulachivanie* (dekulakisation) · *kulak*, *bai*, *manap* and their local equivalents · *lishentsy* (persons deprived of rights) · *spetsperesele*ntsy and *trudposelentsy* (special settlers, labour settlers) · *sotsial'noe proiskhozhdenie* (social origin, the entry on the form that governs a life).

The floor. *Prikaz 00447* and the operational orders with numerical limits by region · *troika* · *osoboe soveshchanie* (the special board) · *vysylka* and *ssylka* (deportation, exile) · *ChON*, *Cheka*, *OGPU*, *NKVD* in their periods.

Extraction. *Zagotovki* (compulsory procurement) · *khlebozagotovki* (grain procurement) · *zakupochnye tseny* (purchase prices) · *MTS* (machine-tractor stations) · *khlopkovaya nezavisimost'* (cotton independence, the slogan under which monoculture was pursued).

Information. *Glavlit* · *spetskhran* (restricted collections) · *perepis'* (census) — and the 1937 and 1939 censuses specifically.

Movement and the closed exit. *Propiska* (residence registration) · the internal passport and who was excluded from it.

The elite. *Nomenklatura* · *pervyi sekretar'* (first secretary) · *sovnarkhoz*.

The cases worth taking, and what each is good for

The Baltic republics, 1940 and 1944. The strongest available test of the counterfactual, because these were literate, industrialised, recently sovereign states with functioning institutions and a documented alternative, taken by secret protocol and then retaken. If the argument that the alternative was another empire holds anywhere, it holds least here.

Western Ukraine and Western Belarus, 1939 and 1944. Acquisition by secret protocol, followed by an armed insurgency that ran into the 1950s. The only Soviet case with a sustained rural resistance of that duration, which makes it the best test of the two-floor structure in Module 1.

Bessarabia and the Moldavian republic, 1940. The delimitation move performed in Europe: a language and a nationhood codified into existence, with a Latin script replaced by Cyrillic to mark the separation. The tightest available comparison with the Central Asian delimitation, on ground where the alternative national identity was directly adjacent and could not be hidden.

Tuva, 1944. Tiny, and the only case of formal accession by petition. That makes it the purest available test of the recognition fiction — a conquest recorded as a request — and it is small enough to be researched exhaustively.

Kaliningrad, from 1945. Complete demographic substitution: the previous population removed, a new one settled, the toponymy replaced entirely. The collection has no other European case of total population replacement and the framework has nothing to say about it yet.

Mongolia, from 1921. Seventy years of nominal sovereignty under effective control, with a domestic party and a domestic

terror. The best available test of the rent-the-chair pattern in a Soviet register, and instructive precisely because the chair was never abolished.

Eastern Europe, 1944–1948. A different instrument — hegemony over sovereign states rather than incorporation — and probably needs its own addendum rather than this one. Worth noting that the framework's questions about a co-opted elite and a maximal demand transfer cleanly, while its questions about settlement and extraction do not.

Afghanistan, 1979–1989. The failure. Failed ventures are badly underrepresented in this collection, for the reason set out in the method paper: decisions that did not work still leave records, while decisions never taken leave none. A case that was attempted and abandoned is the closest the corpus can get to seeing the cost side of the menu directly.

Traps peculiar to this archive

The archive is enormous and self-incriminating, and this produces a specific distortion. You will find the state's own detailed account of its own crimes — the orders, the quotas, the transport manifests, the interrogation records — and comparatively little from the people they were done to, who were not keeping files. A study that weights by documentary volume will end up telling the story from inside the apparatus. Correct for it deliberately: seek out memoir, oral history, émigré testimony and the records of the receiving countries, and say in the sources note what the balance was.

There are three interested traditions, not two. Cold War historiography had a position; post-Soviet national historiographies have positions, and they differ from one another; and the present Russian state has a position. On the famines, on whether the period was colonial, on the delimitation, on the deportations and on the assessment of the whole, expect material written to serve each. Report the readings as each side states them.

The revisionist scholarship is often right and is not the same as apologetics. Specialists working in the delimitation archives have substantially complicated the folk account that borders were drawn to divide and rule, finding extensive local participation and native authorship of the national idea. A study that treats every revision as a defence of the regime will get the history wrong; a study that treats every revision as settled will get it wrong the other way. Read them, and say which parts you are following.

Do not let sincerity be an alibi and do not let it be a joke. The control study establishes that the founders' sincerity was real and made no difference. Both halves are load-bearing. A study that writes the administrators as cynics has taken the easy road and produced a weaker finding than the record supports; a study that writes them as idealists betrayed has produced no finding at all.

And hold the reflexive turn to the end, where it belongs. The mechanism this addendum describes — a claim that cannot be revised, so that failures must be located in persons — is not a property of one doctrine or one country. It is available to any governing group that comes to hold its own account of the world as demonstrated rather than as tested, and the point of noticing it in a case this extreme is that the extremity makes it visible. Where a study ends with the reader safely outside, it has been written for comfort.